

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلِهِ عَلَى رُؤُوسِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

SHA'BĀN, 1349 A.H.

VOL. XVIII.

DECEMBER, 1930 A.C.

No. 12

THE LONDON NIZAMIAH MOSQUE

THE COTTAGE, MORNINGTON AVENUE,
 WEST KENSINGTON, LONDON, W. 14.

November 1930.

To my Muslim Brothers and Sisters, *Asalamo Alaikum*.

IN presenting the Accounts and Balance Sheet of the London Nizamiah Mosque Trust Fund reference may be made to the delays which have been apparent from time to time. To a great extent these have been unavoidable owing to the distances separating the Trustees and the consequent difficulty of arranging meetings to settle matters under consideration. Another difficulty is one which is hardly ever absent where collections of promised donations or subscriptions have to be made.

During my tour from Bombay to Afghanistan, through the Khyber Pass and back through Lahore and on to Hyderabad, I passed through many big towns and was accorded a most hearty reception everywhere; many of the friends I met promised subscriptions which have not yet been gathered in, though doubtless they will be at an early date.

We have, as shown on the Balance Sheet, a copy of which is enclosed herein,¹ purchased a freehold site in Mornington

¹ Vide *Islamic Review* for October 1930.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Avenue, London, W. 14, which has cost us over £28,000, and, to show how land has appreciated in that part of Kensington, this same piece of land—it is about 1 acre 23 poles—is now worth £35,000. It is gratifying to find that so many people who are good judges of land are much impressed with the shape and size of the site itself and the increase in its value since we purchased it. It is close to West Kensington on the District Railway; a line of buses runs past the door, and it is about half a mile from Olympia and Addison Road Station. Olympia is now recognized as one of the chief British and international exhibition centres, and is visited by hundreds of thousands of people from all parts of the world every year.

It is rather difficult to attempt to give any definite figure as to the probable cost of the Nizamiah Mosque and other buildings. There will be the annexes, the minaret—which we hope will be a very handsome structure similar to the Ali Minaret in the Grand Mosque at Mecca—the hostel, and the colonnades, lecture-hall, library, and reading-room, and, last but not least, a pretty garden with fountains playing.

At present we are endeavouring to select a small but capable committee to advise upon the building itself and settle upon the style of architecture, which, I think, should be Indo-Saracenic, since most of the money will probably be coming from India. Then there will be many points respecting the contractors, the amount of work which can be done in India and brought over in panels: wood-carving, tiles, mouldings, etc. I am told that the Paris Mosque cost £80,000 to build and that the Paris Municipality provided the site gratis. A careful inspection of the Paris Mosque convinced me that whatever may be said of the design of the building there can be no question as to the first-class quality of the materials and workmanship. The interior decorations of the Mosque itself are particularly good, and all the carvings and mosaic work show excellent designing and carrying out. We must, I think, see to it that our new London Mosque compares favourably with that in the French capital. It must never be said that the French, whose Muslim population in North Africa and elsewhere numbers about 20,000,000, have secured

THE LONDON NIZAMIAH MOSQUE

a better and more costly building than the British with a Muslim population of over 110,000,000. We have now available for expenditure in building about £32,000, and if, as I roughly surmise, the London Nizamiah Mosque is to cost £100,000, we shall require £68,000 more to complete it.

Then there is the further important question of endowment. We should look for at least £1,500 per annum to cover various outgoings, such as the Imām's salary, assistant's salary, coal, gas, electric supply, painting, repairs, etc.

We have now purchased our site for £28,000, and one question which arises is this: Ought we to start building this costly edifice with only £32,000 in hand, trusting to chance subscriptions to make up the remaining £68,000 as the work progresses: or should we take the more prudent line of waiting until we have secured at least £50,000 more? Many people say that the mere sight of building operations will stimulate wealthy Muslims to be generous, and there may be something in this.

What I am particularly anxious to avoid is seeing the work half-done and held up for want of funds. This is a contingency to be guarded against, as we should very possibly be subjected to the taunts of those who might be only too glad to witness our failure!

We have also to consider the way we shall set about securing our endowment. To produce the £1,500 per annum above suggested, a considerable sum will have to be invested—probably not less than £30,000. So that with these figures before us we may be constrained to look before we leap.

It should be distinctly understood that the London Nizamiah Mosque is to be run on strictly non-sectarian lines, and that the Imāms and others shall not be members of any special sect. They must be Hanifi.

There is a general agreement that the buildings, and especially the Mosque and Minaret, should be of a handsome and imposing type. We want a building which shall be a fitting monument to Islam in an Empire where 110,000,000 Muslims are under our King-Emperor's rule. The greatest city in the world is London, and his Majesty rules over more

Muslims than Christians. So we can, I think, almost claim it as a right to have a handsome Mosque there.

I propose to apply again to the India Office for a grant towards our object. Many of my Muslim friends may remember that during the war I applied to the Government for a grant of £100,000 to enable us to build a Mosque which should be an appropriate memorial to those brave Muslims who had died fighting for the British Empire. At that time my efforts in this direction were abortive, but it is to be hoped that the next venture may meet with some measure of success.

With regard to the raising of further funds, my intention, after leaving Hyderabad, where H.E.H. the Nizam had most generously given £60,000, was to return to England to select the site and then go back to India and proceed to various places not previously visited. Indeed, as soon as the site was finally selected and paid for, I began to prepare for the further effort, but about that time affairs began to be disturbed throughout India and it seemed then to be an inopportune moment to set about collecting money. As I have said previously, there have been many promises of large sums, and I have no doubt that all these will soon be available.

There are three ways of getting in subscriptions: (1) circulars, (2) meetings, (3) personal interviews and applications.

Experience tells me that the first named is nearly useless; the second—though certain of success on a small scale—is so slow that it is almost as bad as the first; the third is the only way by means of which large subscriptions can be secured.

My co-trustees are H.H. The Aga Khan, Sir Abbas Ali Baig, Sir Nizam Jung, B.A., and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. Since we started work we have never been able to hold a full meeting of Trustees, but Sir Abbas Ali Baig and myself have done a considerable amount of what may be called "spade-work" whilst he was in London, and I owe much of our success in securing the present site to his co-operation.

HEADLEY,

Life-Chairman of the London
Nizamiah Mosque Trust Fund.

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

By SHAIKH MUSHĪR HUSAIN KIDWĀ'ī OF GADIA
(Barrister-at-Law)

(Continued from November (1930), "Islamic Review," p. 394.)

14. A MODEL FOR POST-WAR CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

It is not impossible to find a model upon which the future civilization and culture should be based. The Muslim civilization in Spain offers it.

Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole describes a few points of Muslim culture and civilization thus: "Students flocked from France, Germany and England and drank from the fountain of learning which flowed only in the cities of the Moors. The surgeons and doctors of Andalusia were in the van of Science, women were encouraged to devote themselves to serious study, the lady doctor was not unknown among the people of Cordova. Mathematics, astronomy, botany, history, philosophy, and jurisprudence were to be mastered in Spain and Spain alone. The practical work of the field, the scientific methods of irrigation, the art of fortification or shipbuilding, the highest and the elaborate products of the loom, the graver and hammer, the potter's wheel and masonic trowel were brought to perfection by the Moors. In the practice of war, no less than in arts of peace, they long stood supreme." He adds: "*Whatsoever makes a kingdom great and prosperous, whatsoever tends to refinement and civilization, was found in Muslim Spain.*"

Another European writer says that scarcely had the Arabs become finally settled in Spain when they commenced a brilliant career. Adopting what had now become the established policy of the Commanders of the Faithful of Asia, the Emirs of Cordova distinguished themselves as patrons of learning, and set an example of refinement strongly contrasting with the conditions of the native European Princes. Cordova under their administration, at its highest point of prosperity, boasted more than two thousand houses and more

than a million of inhabitants. After sunset a man might walk through it in a straight line for ten miles by the light of the public lamps. Seven hundred years after this there was not so much as one public lamp in London. The streets of Cordova were solidly paved. In Paris, centuries subsequently, whoever stepped over his threshold on a rainy day stepped up to his ankles in mud.

"No nation," adds Draper, "has ever excelled the Spanish Arabs in the beauty or costliness of their pleasure-gardens. To them we owe the introduction of very many of our most valuable cultivated fruits, such as the peach."

Personal cleanliness was really a *religious* duty of every Musulman. In private marble baths Muslims had supplied to them, "through pipes of metal," water, both warm and cold, to suit the season of the year. There were also public baths. The existence of the "great unwashed" was never possible under the Islamic civilization. No Muslim could touch his Holy Book—the Book of God—if he were personally unclean. Draper says: "To those Saracens we are indebted for many of our personal comforts. Religiously clean, it was not possible for them to clothe themselves, according to the fashion of the nations of Europe, in a garment unchanged till it dropped into pieces of itself, a loathsome mass of vermin, stench, and rags. No Arab who had been a Minister of State, or an associate or antagonist of a sovereign, would have offered such a spectacle as the corpse of Thomas à Becket did when his hair-cloth shirt was removed. They taught us the use of the often-changed and often-washed under-garment of linen or cotton which still passes among ladies under its old Arabic name." When I visited Europe a quarter of a century ago there were no baths even in large houses and hotels. In the country bathing (rather *sponging*) could only be done in a small tub put in the bedroom when required. The institution of baths in Europe has come from Turkey. My European friends should excuse me when I tell them that they have not yet grasped fully the idea of cleanliness. They should at least take another lesson from Muslims in this respect and have arrangements for water for cleaning purposes made in their "closets." Christianity

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

has taught the maxim, "Cleanliness is next to Godliness." But as usual it has not taught *how* to remain clean and Godly.

It was not the Arab or Semitic people alone that made a dazzling progress and world-wide conquests under the magical influence of Islam. The Turks or Mongols did the same in Asia and Europe both. The same Turks who worshipped the "White Wolf," and who, like the wolf, were a scourge to men in the shape of Chengiz and others, even when they did make conquests, became marvellous heroes, conquerors, administrators, and civilizers immediately they came under the influence of Islam. India owes almost all its civilization and culture to the Muslim Turks. It was a Turk who built the world-famous "Taj Mahal," which stands even to-day as the most picturesque building in the world. It was under a Turkish sovereign that that revenue system was evolved in India which remains unimproved upon up to this day.

In Europe also it was a Muslim Turk who conquered the unconquerable Constantinople and who established a government there not less civilized or enlightened or glorious than that established by the great Roman founder of that beautiful town itself.

Muhammad Fateh conquered Constantinople, as he himself said, because of the wish, the blessing, and the prophecy of the Holy Prophet whose sacred name he carried. Muhammad Fateh conquered Constantinople after many failures only when he received, as he admitted himself, the spiritual help of a Muslim Saint.

These nations, the Arabs and the Turks both, should take a note of the fact that the more they have followed Islam the more they have prospered. As non-Muslims they were peoples of no consequence in the civilized world. The same has been the case of the Afghans.

Pivoted on the Islamic conception of God, the Muslim nation made not only a miraculous progress in evolving a most refined and intellectual civilization and culture, it also succeeded in democratizing the whole basis of man's social and political institutions and in exhibiting a tolerance which no human institution had exhibited either before Muhammad

or after him. While every other religious system on this earth deprives all those who do not come in the narrow and airtight folds of a particular religion any chance of salvation, Islam gloriously declares that all religions were based on Truth, that all the peoples of the Earth had God-sent Prophets and Guides, and that to whatever religion and persuasion we may belong we should have no fear if we believe in the Creator, in our accountability after death, and if we ACT ARIGHT. While up to this day a negro is lynched in the most "advanced, civilized, and cultured" country, a negro in the time of the Holy Prophet was given the highest place in the Mosque to call Muslims to prayers. Muhammad himself had, and all his followers up to this day cherish, great regard and love for Bilāl—the negro slave of Abyssinia.

Indeed, Islamic civilization was based on perfect tolerance and perfect democracy. Says Renan in his book *Averroès et l'Averroïsme*, "A taste for science and all beautiful things had been established in the tenth century after Christ in this privileged corner of the world [Spain], a toleration of which our modern times would hardly be able to furnish another example. Christians, Jews, Musalmans [I would add Europeans, Asiatics, Africans] spoke the same language, chanted the same songs, and shared in the same literary and scientific studies. *All the barriers which separate men had fallen, all worked with one accord for the progress of the common civilization.*" Renan adds, and please note the word "Mosques" in this quotation: "*The Mosques of Cordova where scholars were counted by thousands became the active centres of scientific and philosophical studies.*"

With the same pivot—the Islamic conception of God—Muhammad changed the very foundations and the course of civilization no less in its political aspects than in moral, social, or religious.

Muslims began to worship a God of the most excellent attributes. But that was not enough to make them live a Godly life. The presence of God everywhere, and His knowledge of our inmost thoughts and most private and concealed actions, were made a living reality. Muhammad commanded "Takhallaqū bi Akhlāqi" 'l-Lāh" ("Imbue yourself with the

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

attributes of God"), and by his personal acts he set an example how that could be done. The result was that Muslims *created* a civilization glorious in refinement, more brilliant, at the same time, in moral grandeur, social purity, and human sympathy and brotherliness.

Muslim civilization had no room for women of ill fame and men of licentious habits. It had no need for "Barnardo Homes" and "Penitentiaries." It had no room for gamblers, no room for exploiters and corner-makers, no room for blood-sucking capitalists or for leeches in the shape of dukes, no room for slave-drivers or merciless and exacting employers. Passion-exciting tango-dances or semi-nude evening-dresses were certainly discouraged. Promiscuous and animal-like intercourse of the sexes was not allowed. Unmarried mothers and war-babies were both unknown to the Muslim society. And so were crime-teaching cinemas. Only such persons formed the Muslim society "who humbled themselves in their prayers," who "kept aloof from vain words," who "loved charitable deeds," who "restrained their appetites (save with their wives)," who "tended well their trusts and their covenants," who "walked upon the earth softly and when the ignorant addressed them they replied 'Peace,'" who "fulfilled their pledges to God and men," who "when they spent were neither lavish nor niggardly but kept the mean," who "feared their Lord and dreaded an evil reckoning," and who, with the "desire to see the face of their Lord," were constant amid trials, and observed prayers and gave alms, in secret and openly, and "turned aside evil by good." (I have taken these characteristics of persons forming the Muslim society from contemporary records of the Qur-án itself.)

Now I challengingly ask those statesmen and reformers who seek for a model in order to imitate it with a view to advancing their own nation and State WHETHER THEY CAN FIND A BETTER MODEL THAN THE MUSLIM NATION AND STATE AS DESCRIBED ABOVE? The Muslim nation offered the best model as a scientific and industrial and materially advancing nation—with exceptional moral attributes and spiritual superiority.

If the Muslim nation in Spain could found a State possessing all "that makes a State great and prosperous," all "that tends to refinement and civilization," and this at a time when the whole world was plunged in an impenetrable darkness and degradation, when there was no precedent to follow, why cannot the Turks and the Afghans and the Persians, etc., reform their States on the same lines and under the same Islam now that there is a light and there have been precedents and examples to be followed? Undoubtedly the Great Teacher and Exemplar can be approached now as he was in Spain and other Muslim countries before. No doubt the Muslim nation can be made a model nation for the Asiatic and European and African and American nations once more under the ever-living Teacher and the Qur-án.

(To be continued.)

THE SECOND COMING OF JESUS

By K. S. MAHMŪD

"9 But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified: for these things must first come to pass; but the end is not by and by.

"10 Then said he unto them, Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:

"11 And great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven.

"12 But before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake.

"13 And it shall turn to you for a testimony.

"14 Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer:

"15 For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.

"16 And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kins-folks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death.

"17 And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake.

"18 But there shall not an hair of your head perish.

"19 In your patience possess ye your souls." (ST. LUKE xxi.)

THE merits of the prophecy which I have quoted lie in its demerits. It is a prophecy which has remained hitherto unfulfilled, though Christian enthusiasts have endeavoured time and again to fix its date.

THE SECOND COMING OF JESUS

The last three verses in the passage cited are held by many to be an interpolation. They did not exist in the oldest existing MS., which is, of course, the origin of all subsequent versions of the Bible, including the Vulgate. A document is absolutely unworthy of serious judicial notice if a portion of it is proved to be a forgery. But here we go a step farther, for the said addition to the original text is admitted to be such even by those who speak of its genuineness.

But let us take the prophecy as it stands. I need not say that it speaks of things at which ordinary common sense can guess, seeing that the events foretold are always occurring from time to time in the course of Nature. Pestilence and war, famine and earthquakes have visited the world so often that a mention of them in a prophecy as a sign of its authenticity would deprive it of any importance it might otherwise possess. Besides, the first followers of a new faith are sure to meet with persecution, especially if they chance to be of inferior social position. But apart from this, the prophecy speaks in one strain of several things, which may or may not occur together at any one time. They have never yet so occurred. The persecution of the disciples began immediately after the departure of Jesus from Judæa. They were "delivered up to the synagogues and into prison, and brought before kings and rulers" for his name's sake. The prediction, however, did not need a prophetic mind, since the persecution had started even when Jesus was with his disciples. These events were the natural sequel of teachings distasteful to the Jews. The disciples no doubt bore every conceivable hardship and trial with patience and courage, but they were sure of the return of the Master in accordance with his promise: "Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done." Belief in these words created a wonderful patience in the generation referred to. But his words passed away though the time did not come for the "heaven and the earth to pass away." Moreover, the days of the disciples' persecution did not witness any unusual phenomena in the form of earthquake, fighting, or pestilence. Even in the period immediately following, the prophesied four events did not

ISLAMIC REVIEW

synchronize. In the last two scores of years of the last two centuries we heard "of wars and commotions." "Nation" did "rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom." "Great earthquakes" were experienced in divers places and famines and pestilence, but neither did the sun become darkened nor the moon fail to give its light, which things had to occur before "the coming of the Son of Man." These words may be taken in a metaphorical sense, but in that case, why should the Adventists look for the second coming in its literal sense? Moreover, most of the above-mentioned phenomena have taken place at times when those who preached and taught in the name of Jesus were not likely, for political reasons, to be brought before kings and rulers for punishment. On the contrary, they had obtained free access into lands that had long been closed against them. All of which goes to prove that either the prediction is folklore or a legendary account of the things of which Jesus spoke on different occasions. Either he himself had had but a hazy notion of coming events, or the recorders of his life, who wrote two centuries after, mixed up hopelessly different things dealing with different matters.

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ÂN

By SYED MAQBOOL AHMED, B.A.

VI

BIBLICAL NAMES IN THE QUR-ÂN

WHILE studying in the new Fourteenth Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* the very brief, very sketchy and altogether unscholarly article on the Koran—more worthy of a shilling encyclopædia which aims to teach old Methodist dames some curious notions about things Islamic than the so-called universal and standard book of reference—my eyes were arrested by the following gems of polemics which once again

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ÁN

clinched the fact that to a Christian writer any old and rotten stick and any occasion is good enough to beat Islam. Says the unnamed writer:

“ Much has been written concerning sources from which Mohammed derived his information; there is no evidence that he was able to read, and his dependence on oral communication may explain some of his misconceptions, i.e. confusion of Haman, the minister of Ahasuerus, with the minister of Pharaoh (xl. 3) and the identification of Miriam, the sister of Moses with Mary (Maryam), the mother of Jesus (xix. 29).”

A wonderful discovery indeed! Never had anybody discovered this incongruity and never was this subject gloated over to the great confusion of Muslims since the Qur-án came to be known in Europe. And to think that the late Sir T. W. Arnold, author of *The Preaching of Islam*, has subscribed his name as one of the editors of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is simply disconcerting. Even the writer of this article, as late as 1924, in the pages of this *Review*, while reviewing Professor Becker's *Islam and Christianity*, had to take notice of this oft-repeated objection by simply recalling all such writers as have answered these silly objections before. But what is one to do? How could you make such people see anything better as insist on living in a paradise where Dr. Zwemer and Mr. Claire Yisdall are their sole guides and companions?

The question, however, has tempted me to make some general remarks about the Biblical names in the Qur-án and compare them with the names given in the Bible, and, if possible, to trace how it is that Muhammad, in spite of his knowledge alleged to have come mainly from the hearsay of the Bible, uses entirely different names for Biblical personages, as, for example, Aazar for Tareh (father of Abraham), Talut for Saul, Fir'aun for Pharaoh, Maryam for Maria, Yahya for Johannan, Isau for Yeshoa, and incidentally to see whether or not a confusion is really made in the name of Haman and Maryam, as our learned writer of the *Encyclopædia* poses to have discovered. Surely Muhammad could not have used different names for Biblical prophets if his knowledge had come

direct from the Hebrews, unless they were known independently to the Arabs by such names? It cannot be suggested that the changes are due to adaptability of the Arabian accent in place of the Hebraic, because both are sister languages with slight differences in the accent. Is it not, then, curious that the Prophet Muhammad, in spite of learning everything from the Jews or Christians, invents names of his own instead of their commonly known names of the Bible? It may be remarked here, further, that if the writer in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* had ever had the privilege and honour of reading the Qur-án, he would find that it, while faithfully recording the story of any prophet, and coherently, too, deviates from and omits that portion only which the Higher Biblical Criticism has found the most unhistorical, absurd, and unworthy in the story; for instance, you will not find in the Qur-án: God resting on the seventh day of creation, the mythical portion, the snake legend of the temptation, the union of Children of God with the daughters of man; Adam's advent in historical times and his genealogy; God walking in the cool breeze of the evening; Cain protected from any harm being done to him by men when he was the only man on earth; Noah's world-wide flood, and his wonderful menagerie of the Ark; Hagar carrying a babe "sixteen years old" on her shoulder to settle in the desert; Abraham's lies, Jacob's deceit, Aaron's treachery, David's adultery, Lot's incest, Solomon's apostasy, told in the same breath as their righteousness in the eyes of God; sun stopping in its orbit, etc.

Talking of Haman as the Vizier of Ahasuerus, it might interest the learned that even the name of Ahasuerus, whose Vizier Haman is said to have been, is entirely fictitious. Let us see what the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says about this name:

"Ahasuerus, a royal Persian name occurring in Ezra iv. 6, Daniel ix. 1, and throughout the Book of Esther, but its occurrence in Tobit xiv. 15 in some Greek MSS. is due to a copyist blunder. . . . In the Book of Esther the king at whose court the scene is laid bears the same Hebrew name, rendered Assueres in the Latin version and Ahasuerus in the English

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ĀN

Bible (but in LXX ' Artaxerxes ' throughout). Most of modern scholars are agreed that here also Xerxes is the king intended. In Dan. ix. 1 ' Ahasuerus ' (Ahasweros) is the father of Darius, who is said to have become king of Babylonia on the death of Belshazzur. The name seems impossible here, however, and is probably due to some accident in the literary transmission. No other name resembling Ahasuerus, nor any name like Darius, is to be found in the list of Median kings. We know, moreover, from Cyrus cylinder as well as from Greek historians, that the immediate successor of Nabonidus and Belshazzur as ruler of Babylonia was Cyrus."

So as regards this Ahasuerus, either Daniel is wrong or Esther or both; the confusion between Darius Hystaspis and Darius the Mede in Holy Writ, placing the one before Cyrus, has always puzzled the critics, and as to Ahasuerus, even the best conjectures have failed to point out any historical Persian monarch. As to Haman and the whole story of Esther, it must be assigned to the only source of Jewish gossip. But in fairness to the Holy Bible, where a greater part of sacred story finds confirmation in the Qur-ān, it may be added that Homan (not Haman) had been the name of some Persian general in the time of Sassanides and is mentioned in the epic of Firdausī, but Haman of the Qur-ān is entirely a different personality and an historical one, and he is none other than the god Ammon of the Egyptian, whose high priest also took the title after his own god. This is the same person whom Milton has called " Lybic Hamman " in his *Nativity*. The high priest of the god Ammon was not only Egypt's chief oracle but chief builder to the king, and none exercised greater authority than he in the land of Egypt after Pharaoh. Read in this light the following verse of the Qur-ān: " And Pharaoh said, O princes, I do not know that ye had another besides me; therefore, do thou, O Haman, burn clay into bricks, and build me a high tower, that I may ascend unto the God of Moses, for I verily believe him to be a liar " (Qur-ān, xxviii. 38).

Heaven alone knows how these Christians jumped to the conclusion that the Qur-ān had been guilty of confusion

ISLAMIC REVIEW

between the Homan of myth and Haman of history. Besides, in their excitement they have gone to the extent of marring the name of a very admirable book of reference. What other motive could there be but blind hatred against Islam!

It will, indeed, be idle to open again the old controversy about Mariam, the sister of Moses, and Mariam, the sister of Aaron and mother of Jesus. This controversy is as old as Islam itself. If my memory does not fail me it was the first objection, as given in the Book of Al-Muslim, which was made by the Christians of Nejran to Mughīra bin Shaiba when he was delegated to Yemen by the Prophet as a missionary of Islam. Mughīra referred this question to the Prophet himself, and he replied that the family of Mary bore the name of Patriarchs and Aaron was not the brother of Moses but it was another Aaron and brother of Mary. Professor 'Abdu 'l-Ahad Dāwūd, the Chaldean Muslim, in one of his letters to me has assured me that Aaron was really the brother of Mary the mother of Jesus; apart from this, the exclamation, "O sister of Aaron, thy father or mother were not transgressors," is simply to heighten the reproach by relating Mary to her ancestor, as she was in the line of the priestly class of Levy, the direct descendant of Aaron.

But if there is still left some doubt in the absurdity of this proposition, we will call to our aid Mr. Sale, the translator of Al-Quran. To say that one did not know of the existence of Mr. Sale's translation by one who rushes into regions where angels fear to tread is entirely inexcusable, as his translation could be had for a couple of shillings. He says:

"From the identity of names it has been generally imagined by Christian writers that the Koran here confounds Mary the mother of Jesus with Mary or Miriam the sister of Moses and Aaron. . . . I do not see how it can be made out from the words of Koran. For it does not follow, because two persons have the same name, and have each a father and brother who bear the same names, that they must necessarily be the same person; besides, such a mistake is inconsistent with a number of other places in the Koran, whereby it manifestly appears that Mohammed well knew and asserted that Moses preceded Jesus several ages. And the commentators fail not to tell us

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ÁN

that there had passed about one thousand eight hundred years between Amran the father of Moses, and Amran the father of the Virgin Mary. . . . It must be observed that though the Virgin Mary is called in the Koran the sister of Aaron, she is nowhere called the sister of Moses."

To turn to other topics.

The Qur-án says: "Call to mind when Abraham said to his father Azar, Dost thou take images for gods? Verily I perceive that thou and thy people are in a manifest error" (chap. vi). Now the Bible and Jewish tradition say that Abraham's father was called Tareh or Terah, which bears hardly any resemblance to Azar. The commentators of the Qur-án, who were chiefly guided in such matters by their Jewish compatriots, took them at their word and tried to explain away the apparent inconsistency with Biblical names. They explained it in their own fashion by saying that it stands really for the uncle of Abraham, who was known by this name. That, however, becomes entirely superfluous and unnecessary in view of the following remarks in the translation of Al-Quran by Sale, whose scholarship and research sometimes come greatly to our aid. He says:

"This is the name which the Mohammedans give to Abraham's father, named in the Scriptures Terah. However, some of their writers pretend that Azar was the son of Terah, and D'Herbelot says that the Arabs always distinguish them in their genealogies as different persons; but because Abraham was the son of Terah according to Moses, it is therefore supposed by European writers that Terah is the same with the Azar of the Arabs. How true this observation may be in relation to some authors I cannot say, but I am sure it cannot be true of all; for several Arab and Turkish writers expressly make Azar and Terah the same person. Azar, in ancient times, was the name of the planet Mars, and the month of March was so called by the most ancient Persians, for the word originally signifying fire (as it still does), supposed of a fiery nature, was acknowledged by the Chaldeans and Assyrians as a god or planetary deity, whom in old times they worshipped under the form of a pillar: whence Azar became the name

ISLAMIC REVIEW

among the nobility, who esteemed it honourable to be denominated from their gods, and is found in the composition of Babylonian names. For these reasons a learned author supposes Azar to have been the heathen name of Terah, and that the other was given him on his conversion. Al Beidhawi confirms this conjecture, saying that Azar was the name of the idol which he worshipped. It may be observed that Abraham's father is also called Zarah in the Talmud, and Athar by Eusebius."

So Muhammad, in using Azar for Tareh, could possibly have no inspiration from the Jews; and if he was at all right, the only possible explanation would be that his source of inspiration was not the present Bible but something else.

In the same way, the word Fir'aun in the Qur-án for Pharaoh in the Bible might look to a superficial observer to be only a difference of accent, but this is not so. Pharaoh is undoubtedly the Hebraized title of the King of Egypt; what he was called by the Egyptians themselves is not known, but apparently it was not Pharaoh, and had Muhammad heard this title from the Hebrews there was no earthly reason why he should not use Pharaoh in Arabic, there being no justification for adding in the last "n," as in Arabic. It is not difficult to pronounce "Fero." But on looking into the Book of Herodotus I find that he uses Peron for Pharaoh, the very title which the Qur-án has used. Herodotus' information about this title must be direct and first hand; was this also of Muhammad? Yes, in one sense, for the real author of the Qur-án is far better informed than the Jews, and if later a Greek historian whose work could never have been consulted by the Prophet Muhammad in Mecca accidentally comes to confirm it, it might give some food for reflection to those who lightly talk of Muhammad obtaining his information from the Jews.

But perhaps the strangest of all corruptions is to be found in the name of Yahya for Yohannan or John. The Hebrew Yohannan means God has been pleased. What is Yahya, and why is it used for Yohannan? We find the following in the Qur-án:

"O Zacharias, verily We bring thee tidings of a son, whose

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ÁN

name shall be Yahya; we have not caused any to bear the same name before him . . ." (Qur-án, xix).

Mark the last sentence. In Luke i. 62 we find an echo of this where it is said that none of Zacharias' kindred was called by that name. The question is, if Yohannan were the name given to the son of Zacharias, would it have been a unique name never borne by any child before? But was it a fact? No; Yohannan was as common a name amongst the Jews as John is amongst the Christians. The name Yahya, which is used in the Qur-án for that of John the Baptist, is under no circumstances one of the various forms of John; it is quite a different name. As to Elijah, which in the modern Armenian and Syrian is called Yeghia; the Armenians, like the Turks, use "h" for "kh" and *vice versa*. For instance, a Turk will pronounce Ahmed as Achmet, and Sheikhu 'l-Islam as Shehul Islam. So Yeghia is easily called Yehya, and it is possible that John the Baptist was called after the name of Elijah, because the Jews thought that if he was not the Messiah or the promised Prophet, he was surely Elijah, this name bearing some resemblance. But this will hardly stand, as Elijah is pronounced "Elyas" in the Qur-án. The conclusion is irresistible. Yehya is no invention of the Prophet Muhammad as it has some meaning in Hebrew; it is not another form of Yohannan as the name Yahya was never borne by any Jew before.

We should now turn to the word Jesus. Jesus was not a unique name, as both its Hebraic forms, Isau and Yeshua, were used before. The point is to find out by what name of the two Jesus was called, by Esau as given in the Qur-án or by Yeshua as given in the Bible. Granting the Hebrew form of the name Yeshua to be the Arabic form, Esau at a glance shows itself to be a somewhat violent change, inasmuch as the "ain" of the Arabic language is the first consonant, while in Hebrew it is the last; and as I have shown that Arabic and Hebrew are the sister languages, no such change is called for. Now Yeshua in Hebrew means God his Saviour—Yehoshua—whose abridgment Yeshua is, but this strikes at the very root of Jesus' subsequent claims; for instead of being saviour to mankind, he depends for his own salvation upon God. One

thing should be pointed out before we go any further. Among the Jews it is a sin to write and pronounce the name of Jesus, just as heathen Meccans, instead of pronouncing Muhammad, used some other epithet for the Prophet, such as Amin; the Jews in referring to Jesus always called him Masloob or the crucified one. They would not even name their children with the name of Joseph, the putative husband of Mary; so hateful to them are the names of Jesus and his family. There is therefore no question as to what the Jews called him. They neither called him Yeshua nor Esau, the latter name being also particularly hateful to them. There are, however, two instances that evidence what the form of the name in Hebrew was in the early centuries of the Christian Era. A Jewish-Christian sect, the Valentinians, spelled it Esau, and in accordance with the Rabbinical modes of thought fancied that the name consisted of the initial letters of three words, i.e. Jehovah, heaven, and earth. In a Jewish history of Jesus, in itself libellous and blasphemous, little known among the Jews, but of considerable antiquity, the name is spelt in the same way.

What seems to me very probable in this violent change in the name of Jesus is that many hopes were reared upon the career of Jesus by his early disciples. He was to be the king of the Jews, who would liberate them from the Roman yoke. It was natural, therefore, for such enthusiasts to make his name resemble the warrior of Israel who succeeded to the command after Moses, and conquered the Holy Land for the Children of Israel. Will not Jehovah the Holy fulfil His promise again through a person who will bear the name of a great conqueror? A parallel example is to be found amongst Muslims about Mahdi, who it is believed will bear the name of the Holy Prophet and will come at the end of the world to deliver Islam from its bondage.

As to Mary the mother of Jesus, the name was more common among the daughters of Israel than the name of her son. If I am not greatly mistaken—for I am no scholar of Hebrew—I may hazard that Maria in Hebrew is equivalent to Mara in Arabic, it being pronounced Marayya in the 'Irāqī Arabic. The word simply means a woman, and it is probable that the

SUPERNATURALISM OF AL-QUR-ÁN

Jews called their womenfolk with no name but Maria, qualified by the patronymy, or some other epithets, such as Maria daughter of Amran, or Maria of Majdelan. Women neither amongst the Israelites nor amongst any other people had any status whatsoever, and like domestic animals were not honoured by any particular names. So out of the thousand-and-one Marias among the Israelites there were only two that were worthy of any particular title, one the sister of Moses and Aaron, the other, mother of Jesus. Both bore the simple name of Maria, but it is curious that the former name should be changed into Mariam and the latter should be allowed to remain as Maria, though in the Qur-án both are called Maryam. The reason is simple. In Hebrew, when "m" is added to the end of any name it shows that the person's name is sanctified with dignified memory (cf. Moshi and Moshiam, Nabi and Nabiiam). The Jews had every reason to glorify the memory of the sister of their great Lawgiver, hence they always called her Mariam, or "Our Maria." As to the mother of Jesus, in the eyes of the Jews she was worse than a common woman, and to call her Mariam, resembling the name of the venerable Prophet's sister was unthinkable. She was nothing but Maria pure and simple. It was the Qur-án and Muhammad who raised her to the status equal to or greater than her namesake.

We find another curious change in the name of Saul, which in the Qur-án is called Talut. I do not know what Saul means in Hebrew, but I am certain that when Saul was anointed king by Samuel he must have changed his name into a word which means "Livelong." We have an exact parallel of this in the change of the name of Paul, the disciple of Jesus Christ, who was also called Saul before he was converted. I am unable to throw further light on this subject and would welcome a Hebrew scholar to guide me in this matter.

There are scores of other names in the Qur-án which have not been identified with any Biblical name, as for instance Hud, Shuaib, Luqman, Dhulkifl, Dhulgarnain. Hud has been identified with Eber and Shuaib with Jethro, but this is absurd. They are non-Biblical personalities, and their history must be sought elsewhere.

THE PROPHET'S CONDUCT TOWARDS THE HELPLESS

By MUHAMMED 'ALĪ AL-HAJJ SALMĪN

FORTUNATE is he who studies the life of Muhammad with the idea of reviewing those examples of conduct which it is essential that man should follow, exhibited in his career. For if he was an ideal to the conqueror, the king, and the rich man, he was equally a guide to the poor labourer and the outcast. To-day there is no one who doubts the compact beauty of Muhammad's rectitude, and the nobility of his character. It may not be generally admitted, but it is none the less a fact, that the world-train of our time is roaring along the actual lines laid down by the great Arabian Prophet some thirteen hundred years ago.

It is a matter for great regret that the Muslims, besides abandoning all virtues, should also have renounced the habit of following their beloved Prophet, and it is on this account only that they are mistrusted everywhere to-day. Their state is such that they have no character now. They are the perpetrators of mean things against those who are stronger, and they are puffed up with pride against those who are weaker.

They can never forgive their enemies; but the founder of Islam always forgave his own when they were brought to him for judicial punishment. 'Abdullā, father of Abī, was the Prophet's greatest enemy. It was he who continually stirred up the Jews and Christians against Muhammad. When he died the Prophet prayed for him and gave his own shirt to serve as a pall over his coffin.

When Mecca was captured he forgave all his enemies there who had stuck at nothing in their efforts to torture and kill him and his little band of faithful followers. Never in his life did he say to a beggar, "Go away!" or, "Call again!" If he had anything, he gave him it at once, or else asked him to wait until he could procure elsewhere that which had been asked for. It was his nature innate in him to love the poor, the helpless, and the weak. He loved also the orphans and widows—a fact which can be verified from the numerous injunctions con-

PROPAGANDA AGAINST MUSLIMS

cerning them contained in the Holy Qur-án; and it is evident that no one else could be expected to follow those injunctions to the letter if the Prophet did not do so himself. He could bear the greatest hardships, but he could not bear to see others suffer. He was the first and foremost person to stand up for the rights of women and children; and the slave, who was considered a mere chattel in those days, was for the first time given rights in respect of his master. The King's absolutism was made subject to the rights of his subjects, and a democratic Government was initiated in the country. The Prophet loved children, so much so that even on his journeys he used to kiss children if he found them. He always comforted the sick and accompanied a dead man's coffin to the grave. He never talked to a man in anger, and never abused anybody in his life. Forgiveness was a virtue in him, which showed itself to the utmost when in the Battle of Ohud his teeth were broken and yet he spoke no word against his foes.

In short, to whatever extent we study the life of the Prophet we shall find it always an embodiment of virtue, and purity of thought and character, which remains absolutely matchless in all times, past, present, and to come.

CHRISTIAN PROPAGANDA AGAINST MUSLIMS

By SHEIKH S. M. S. FARUQUE

THE facts which I am going to mention below may be known to a certain number of educated Muslims, but it is just as well that the whole Muslim reading public should become aware of them and be warned beforehand, because being forewarned is being forearmed, and in these times of religious controversies it is doubly important that we Muslims should not be left behind others. A vehement propaganda is carried on against Islam, especially by American missionaries. Some of them have acquired, during their stay in Egypt, a very thorough knowledge of Arabic, and for many years past they have been writing books in Arabic and English the object of which, on the face of the writings, has been to convert Muslims to their own

ISLAMIC REVIEW

faith of dogmatized Christianity. Their tactics are to copy verses from the Holy Qur-án in the Arabic writings and to mix them up with quotations from the Arabic translations of the Old and New Testaments and to persuade Muslims and others to believe that they are great admirers of the beauties of the Holy Qur-án, Muslim Traditions, Islamic philosophy, and yet at the same time to make their readers join hands with them in their own faith. English books of some of them are also numerous. For instance, Dr. Zwemer has written (1) *The Glory of the Cross*, (2) *Call to Prayers*, (3) *The Law of Apostacy in Islam*. This Dr. Zwemer is also the editor of a quarterly periodical known as *The Moslem World*. The expressed object of this publication is to get information from all Muslim countries in the world with a view to carrying on a world-wide propaganda in Muslim lands by spreading Christian missionary literature amongst Muslims printed in the language of the country where the missionaries carry on their propaganda, and also by means of personal contact with Muslims, educated and uneducated, and by means of carrying this propaganda into the houses of Muslims. It will suffice to quote a single paragraph from the cover of the said periodical to show what Dr. D. M. Zwemer and his fraternity wish to do with us Muslims. The quotation is as follows:—

“ *Will You Help Send the Gospel to Moslems?* ”

“ Christ and His Message are interpreted to Moslems through Christian Literature published in Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Urdu, Panjabi, Chinese, and other languages spoken by Moslems. By your prayers and gifts you can help to supply this much-needed Christian literature for Egypt, Syria, Irak, China, Morocco, Palestine, Persia, Java, Algiers, Turkey, India, Sumatra, Tunis, Arabia, Malaysia, South Africa.

“ Will you help the Christian missionaries in these countries by sending your gifts through—

“ The American Christian Literature Society for Moslems co-operating with the Nile Mission Press and Interdenominational Committees on the field? ”

I have made the above lengthy quotation in order that the reader may be fully aware of the doings of these missionaries.

PROPAGANDA AGAINST MUSLIMS

In December, 1929, Dr. Zwemer wrote to the Imām of the Mosque, Woking, asking for a copy of the translation of the Holy Qur-án by my father, and he was kind enough to acknowledge the receipt, and has written very nice letters to my father, in one of which he writes: "I appreciate more and more the real values that are found in Islam and its strong conception of God, as well as its Theistic philosophy." To this letter my father replied, saying, among other things, that if that were so the best course for Dr. Zwemer was to believe in the One God. To this Dr. Zwemer replied in a very kind and courteous letter saying, *inter alia*, "I was made very happy by your kind letter of the 18th June which seems to have been delayed in transmission. I appreciate fully your frank and beautiful words inviting me to become a Muslim and I wish I had an opportunity to talk with you rather than write." But, in spite of all this, Dr. Zwemer is still a believer in the divinity of Jesus, and his appreciation of the Muslim conception of the Godhead is far from complete. He has been good enough to send us (my father and myself) a number of books in Arabic and English, one of which is written by himself and is styled *Christianity the Final Religion*. The main object of this book is to impress upon Christian missionaries in Muslim lands that the doctrines of atonement and crucifixion of Christ and the sonship of Christ are the foundation rocks on which Christianity stands. This is made very plain in the Preface, where Dr. Zwemer reproves the modern missionary who insists more on the teachings and the spirit of Jesus rather than the doctrinal points of Christianity. "On the contrary," says Dr. Zwemer on p. 1 of the Preface, "we believe that the very nature of Christianity, its dynamic, its passion, its power of missionary appeal, its *esse* and its *bene esse*, consists in its credo—its belief in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, who died on the Cross for our sins and rose again, who gave us this message as our only commission and sealed it with the promise of His presence."

In fact, Dr. Zwemer is entirely Pauline in his faith, and ch. i of the book under discussion is entirely devoted to the first epistle of Paul. On p. 23, Dr. Zwemer writes, "To

ISLAMIC REVIEW

us who work among Muslims, their denial of Jesus Christ's mission, His incarnation, His atonement, His deity are the very issues of the conflict. . . . The challenge of the Muezzin, who calls to Muslim prayer, is a cry of pain, it hurts." . . . "Face to face with Islam one cannot help asking what will be the final outcome of Christian Unitarians." And I wonder whether, when he wrote to my father about his appreciation of the Muslim conception of God, he had forgotten his own writings or was merely trying to bait my father. But the fact is that the reverend gentleman has been caught in his own trap and made to confess that he is still as bigoted as ever. This love of Dr. Zwemer for the old Christianity of Paul and his desire to spread his faith in Muslim lands put him in great pain and force him to most damaging statements against his own cause. He is pained to see the doctrine of the Oneness of God spreading all over the world, even among the Christians. He is pained also by the success of Muslim missionary work, as the following quotation will show.

"Of all the non-Christian religions, perhaps, Islam has shown most of all the power of immense and lasting momentum. We have a missionary propagandism; we have committees and boards and treasurers; we have literature and enthusiasm; but where can you point in Christendom to a missionary spirit like that which has breathed throughout the Mohammedan world for thirteen centuries? Their Laymen's Missionary Movement does not have its tenth anniversary, but its thirteen-hundredth! . . .

" . . . the whole laity of the Moslem world has been missionary in Africa and Asia for all these centuries until to-day there are over two hundred million nominal Mohammedans. Moslems are not inactive to-day. They are publishing Thomas Carlyle's *The Hero as Prophet*, and selling it for two annas on the streets of Lahore. They are copying the Koran and printing it for the pagan tribes in the heart of Africa. They are winning over, against Christian missions in some parts of Africa, thousands and tens of thousands of converts. The non-Christian religions, the greatest of them, are in motion to-day " (pp. 47-48).

PROPAGANDA AGAINST MUSLIMS

In his utter hopelessness he puts the following question: "Are not Christian Science and New Thought and other modern cults saying to-day, 'Any God except one who died on the Cross'?" It appears to me as if God is employing these Christian missionaries to destroy their faith which they wish to propagate, for Dr. Zwemer is forced to take note of the writings of Muslims against his faith, one of the most important of which is an article by Seyyid Mohammed Rashid Ridha, in *Al Manār*, in which the Muslim writer devotes twelve pages of print refuting Christian dogmas and summarizes his objections to Paulinism as follows:—

"1. It is opposed to reason.

"2. It is opposed to theism. How can God, who is Omnipresent and everlasting, degrade Himself by dwelling in a virgin's womb?

"3. It is opposed to God's knowledge, for the plan of salvation—if such it is—was an afterthought.

"4. It is opposed to both the mercy and justice of God; to His mercy because He allowed Christ to suffer, being innocent, without delivering Him; and to His justice in allowing those who crucified Him to do it unpunished.

"5. It leads to impiety, because if this is the way to salvation, then no matter how wicked a man is he finds deliverance through the Cross, and will never be punished for his sins.

"6. It is unnecessary. We have never heard it stated by any reasonable person, or those who are learned in Law, that the attribute of justice is abrogated by the pardon of a criminal; on the contrary, it is considered a virtue to pardon an offender. Why should not God do so?"

To this Dr. Zwemer can make no reply except abuse of our Holy Prophet. He even makes the base suggestion that the doctrine of atonement should be inculcated to Shiahs because the latter are supposed to believe that they will be saved by the death of Husein (p. 88).

But with regard to other Muslims he puts the following poser to his brother missionaries: "But how," says he (p. 89), "is it in regard to orthodox Islam? Should we emphasize this doctrine of the crucifixion where it is bitterly opposed

and vigorously disputed? Would it not be the part of worldly wisdom and of missionary strategy to keep the Cross and the Atonement (as well as the doctrine of the Trinity) well in the background and present to the Muslims the *life of Christ* rather than His death as the theme of our Gospel? Shall we not follow the discretion [or was it the fear?] of the Sudan authorities in the matter of the postage-stamps, and remove even the water-marks of the Cross from our preaching lest we offend our Moslem brethren?"

In spite of all this, however, he goes on advising them to preach the absurd doctrines so tersely refuted in *Al Manār*.

The most distressing thing to Dr. Zwemer is the fact that Christian missionaries do not dare to preach the doctrine of atonement to Muslims and he therefore has a chapter entitled "The Stumbling-block of The Cross," in which his agony of mind is very clearly visible and in which after mentioning the objections of Muslims to the doctrine of atonement and the denial of the Holy Qur-án that Christ died on the Cross, he goes on with the said stumbling-block of the Cross in his hands, like a blind follower of the blind, and thinks that he can succeed in breaking the solid objections against his doctrine, and he quotes the following paragraph from *The Death of Christ*, by Denny: "We may begin as wisely as we please with those who have a prejudice against it, or whose conscience is asleep, or who have much to learn both about Christ and about themselves before they will consent to look at such a gospel, to say nothing of abandoning themselves to it; but if we do not begin with something which is essentially related to the Atonement, presupposing it or presupposed by it or involved in it, something which leads inevitably, though it may be by an indirect and unsuspected route, to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, *we have not begun to preach the gospel at all.*"

Translation of the Quran (without Arabic Text), by Maulānā Muhammad 'Alī, pp. cxxi, 631, 8vo. Printed on thin opaque paper; cloth 10s.; flexible binding 12s., postage 5d. extra.

NOTES

NOTES

Palestine and the Dead Sea.

As a result of a "war to save Belgium" certain self-styled sympathetic nations, who announce loudly to the listening earth that they have a warm corner in their hearts for what they term the weaker and less civilized nations, and are ready to hold out all sorts of promises so long as their pockets remain untouched, acquired without a blush over a million square miles of additional territory. These huge areas still go under the fanciful and ingenious name of "mandated territories," the real meaning of which is made even clearer and more clear to the world when one realizes the implication contained in the words of General Schnee, the last Governor of German East Africa, who at a meeting of protest against "the proposed incorporation of German East Africa in the British Colonial Empire," held in Berlin on November 21, 1930, said: "England, at the end of the war, failed to realize her aim of seizing the German colonies as war booty, and only obtained mandatory authority over them. She now hoped to accomplish the practical annexation of the former German East Africa by uniting this mandated territory with her adjoining colonies. In this way England, though satiated with colonial possessions, hoped to form a colonial State twice the size of Germany and illegally to acquire vast possibilities of exploitation."

Palestine was one of such fateful acquisitions, but under the pretext of giving a National Home to the Jews. Its conquest will always remain a lasting disgrace to the name of Muslims, especially the Indian Muslims who helped under Lord Allenby to conquer it. But it is of no earthly use to cry over spilt milk. Let us face the facts as they are.

Lord Balfour, when the fate of England was hanging in the balance, seized (as Sir Hall Caine set forth in a letter purporting to be his conversation with the late Lord Balfour a few months ago to the *Sunday Times*, London) on a dream of certain pious Jews as well as on the covetousness of other Jews who had long had their eyes on the immensely rich

ISLAMIC REVIEW

resources of Palestine and the Dead Sea. To save the sinking ship of the British Empire he gave the Jews a promise which he never thought could be fulfilled or the British Isles would ever be called upon to fulfil, and got what he wanted—gold. The Jews—not the average Jew who cares not an owl's hoot for the National Home in Palestine, but the financial Jew—saw a great field of exploitation in the immensely extensive riches of the Dead Sea. This view is borne out by the facts and figures which the National League, London, whose services in the support of the Arab cause are worthy of the highest praise, has issued for the information of the British public, and which we take the liberty of printing below for the benefit of the Muslim public.

As to the mineral values, the manifesto says:

“Palestine is not a derelict land. It is the most strategic and one of the minerally richest areas of the world. Dr. Homer's plans for the development of the Dead Sea have been acknowledged the most favourable to Palestine and Trans-jordan in both Houses of Parliament. Major Brock, the Government Expert, has calculated the amount of salts in solution, and his approximate estimates are:

	2,000	million tons	of Potassium Chloride (Potash)
"	11,900	" "	Sodium Chloride (Common Salt)
	22,000	" "	Magnesium Chloride (Magnesium)
	6,000	" "	Calcium Chloride
	980	" "	Magnesium Bromide (Bromine)

“From the waters of the Dead Sea alone the amount of potash would supply the world with 1,000,000 tons a year for over 2,000 years. The supply may be said to be inexhaustible, and the conditions are much more advantageous than those at the Stassfurt Mines.

“The available gold in the Dead Sea is moderately estimated as being worth £5,000,000,000. Professor Claude, the French scientist, has made an even higher estimate.

“Why has this property of great potential wealth been taken from the British people and the Arabs and handed over to a group of international financiers?”

The above facts are supported by the Zionist opinion. For

NOTES

instance, *The New Palestine*, a Zionist paper published in New York, reports Lord Melchett from a speech of his at a conference of Zionists and non-Zionists, Baltimore Hotel, New York, October 20, 1928, thus:

" . . . I sincerely trust that you will put the very great weight which you have in this country behind this movement. It is worth it. It is not only worth it, it becomes an absolute necessity. And let me tell you, you cannot afford to wait. While we are discussing, other people are acting. Whereas we have reports as to possibilities in Palestine, Gentiles are acquiring land and beginning to take possession of the best things in the country.

" Let me warn you of what is going on. Powerful syndicates are being formed by wealthy men—non-Jews—and this movement is growing rapidly; and let me tell you why in a few sentences.

" Palestine has always been a highway of the world. I once defined it as the Belgium of the East, situated between much larger and more powerful countries. It is to-day still a highway. I travelled there last year through Syria, Damascus, Baghdad, and Persia, the enormous hinterland behind Palestine, the outlet of the whole Middle East.

" What is happening to-day? The Harbour of Haifa is the finest harbour on the Mediterranean after Alexandria, Naples, and Genoa. That harbour is going to be developed by the Government. The development of that harbour will be the beginning of the real economic life of Palestine. That harbour will be the outlet of the great pipe-line of all that is coming from Mesopotamia. It will be the outlet of a great railway. Haifa, in twenty to twenty-five years, will become a port similar to Genoa or Alexandria. And there is nothing about this that is Jewish. It is its geographical position that makes it the outlet of that country. I paint the picture. It is not a picture. It is not a prophecy; it is an economic development that is bound to happen. Other people have seen it. They are beginning to acquire land, to take up the position. If we do not get together and do something within the next five years the opportunities may be so slight and the ideal we

ISLAMIC REVIEW

have set before ourselves in Palestine may never be realized. *I am not troubling about the economic development of Palestine. That is assured. The problem is, Who will do it?*"

The Right Hon. Sir Herbert Samuel, speaking on Palestine in February 1929, estimated £800,000,000 worth of natural wealth in one small corner of Palestine.

Mr. Gershon Agronsky, in December 1927, said:

"Palestine is still waiting breathlessly to hear that Mr. Novomeysky has been granted the Dead Sea Concession. We are too far from the centre of things in London to know what is causing the delay. The bidders for the Concession are the kind of interests with whom secrecy is a policy, so we don't know what the competition is about. We are fed on rumours. Enthralled by the prospects of what the Dead Sea will yield in potash wealth and Jewish labour, we can only hope that the Concession will not much longer hold us in suspense. This Concession must not be snatched from Jewish hands. It is enough that the Huleh Concession seems to be slipping out of our grasp, largely due to our national unpreparedness."

Mr. Eliezer Rieger, on December 30, 1927, said:

"... We hold the keys of industry, the Rutenberg and the Dead Sea Concession. . . . All this has been accomplished by shattered Jewry after the war, and after the entire destruction of the Jewish Centre in Russia. . . ."

The following questions and answers in the House of Commons are illuminating:

Col. Sir Frederick Hall: Assuming that both British capital and capital from other sources were safe, will my Right Hon. Friend undertake that, all things being equal, the preference in these circumstances shall be given to British capital? Surely that is reasonable?

Mr. Amery: I could not give that undertaking.

Mr. Erskine: Does the Right Hon. Gentleman consider the Concession of very great value?

Mr. Amery: No, Sir. The Concession is purely speculative. It may be of value or it may not. It consists of a great deal of potassium chloride in the Dead Sea.

NOTES

Colonel Howard-Bury: Is the Right Hon. Gentleman aware that it will be of great value, as the price of potash is very high, and this is the only means of bringing it down?

The following extracts from speeches in the House of Lords supplement the above:

Right Hon. Lord Melchett in the House of Lords, March 20, 1929:

"I think it is a very dangerous thing that statements should be made in this House which may be used afterwards by company promoters, and groups of financiers, some of them none too scrupulous, to lure unwary investors into the idea that there is a golden fortune in the Dead Sea potash. . . .

"I know Mr. Novomeysky and I have discussed the matter with German, French, and English experts. None of them recommends that large financial groups should invest in the Dead Sea potash. . . . They (the noble Lords) draw pictures which, if formulated in a prospectus, might lead people with insufficient knowledge to embark money in what I must describe as a somewhat speculative enterprise. . . .

"You cannot bring potash all the way from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean and then on to this country at a cheaper rate than we get it from Germany.

"The German people will see that this does not happen."

The late Lord Thomson:

"The noble Lord Melchett has made some rather discouraging remarks about potash. From his account I gather that this commodity is a drug on the market; that those who purvey it do so as philanthropists. . . .

"To hear the noble Lord, Lord Melchett, one would think that only a born fool would develop the Dead Sea, and yet we have seen reports upon the Dead Sea which show that it contains not only potash but other substances of very great value. I hesitate again to make a suggestion on this subject to the noble Lord, but I was personally attracted to this matter by the report, on very high chemical authority, that magnesium was obtainable from the Dead Sea salts, even in paying quantities, and as a commercial proposition. I need hardly say to your Lordships, still less to the noble Lord, that

ISLAMIC REVIEW

if magnesium is obtainable it is going to make a very great difference in various forms of engineering.

"What appeals to me most in this matter is the consideration that we want to safeguard ourselves against a possible repetition of what happened in the early part of the war, when potash went up—however valueless it may be in the eyes of the noble Lord, Lord Melchett—to the fabulous price of £80 per ton.

"We do want to stop that . . . so that should an unforeseen emergency arise we shall not be victimized again as we were in 1914."

The Chairman of the National League thus summarizes the situation:

"The Dead Sea was finally granted to Mr. Moses Novomeysky on January 1, 1930, without British Parliament being given an adequate opportunity of discussing it. Though British names are prominent, the influences behind are predominantly Zionist, with Jewish international finance. The real issues are the economic ones, and the Zionist policy for economic predominance involves the suppression of Arab rights, as well as injustice to the finest British plans."

Solidarity in Muslim Countries and the Turkish Republic.

Since the conclusion of the war the events of the world have been moving with a dazzling swiftness. The unexpected has now almost become the inevitable. Already there are preparations for a new war whereof the havoc, it is predicted, will be more horrible than ever before. The representatives of certain European countries, men like Signor Mussolini, have already begun to rattle their swords, and the disintegration of the solidarity of Muslim countries, kept together by the institution, however defective, of the Caliphate in Turkey and her drinking at the corrupt polluted fountain of European concepts of nationalism—an aspect of social life which Islam sought to control by making the sympathies of a Muslim extra-territorial—are causing many ominous signs to appear on the horizon, which point to a very dark future.

It is not for us to carry coals to Newcastle, nor do we

NOTES

intend to appear to do so by playing the part of adviser, but one thing is certain, that the post-war Turkish Republic, in consequence of certain haphazard and inconsiderate actions, has, if not actually alienated the sympathies of the outside Muslim world, at least given the impression that it is ready to flout its susceptibilities and sympathies. Either it is because the Turks do not understand on which side their bread is buttered or that they do not realize the value of solidarity. What, after all, was the cause and mainspring of their power and influence in the world politics before the war? Just Islam and the moral support of the whole Muslim world. To what, after all, must we attribute the present tenth-rate position of the Turks in particular and of all Muslim peoples in general? An answer to this question is not far to seek. Muslims have fallen away from the Holy Qur-án which warns them continually when it says, in chapter viii. 46, "And obey Allah and His Prophet and do not quarrel, for then you will be weak. Surely Allah will be the patient." Already there are speculations rife as to what the lot of the nascent Turkish Republic will be after the strong personality of Mustapha Kemal is removed from the scenes.

Sir Charles Petrie, Bart., in discussing the modification of the various post-war Peace Treaties, observes (*vide Sunday Times* for November 9, 1930):

Lastly, there is the demand for Italian colonial expansion, though what actual form the latter should take is subject to considerable difference of opinion. Some would have an outlet on the Gulf of Guinea, with a corridor to it from Libya, but Signor Mussolini is said to favour expansion within the Mediterranean, and in this he has undoubtedly the majority of his fellow countrymen with him. In the present circumstances this can only mean the cession of Eastern Tunis by France, which is out of the question; the transference of the Syrian Mandate, which is highly improbable; or the occupation of Asia Minor upon the break-up of Turkey, which most Italians believe will follow the death or resignation of Mustapha Kemal. It is, indeed, impossible to discuss the problem of colonial expansion in Italian political circles without feeling that Asia Minor is the ultimate goal.

Arabia Marches On.

The whole of the Muslim world is rejoicing at the steady progress towards unification which Arabia, under the wise and

ISLAMIC REVIEW

benign rule of His Majesty King Ibn Saud, is continually making. The recognition of his sovereignty over Assir is another milestone reached in this uphill task. Moreover, modern inventions are being utilized by the Hedjaz Government. Wireless has recently been installed, although not for broadcasting educational programmes. But as such a beginning has been made, it is not too much to expect that another forward step will very shortly be taken. It now remains to be seen how far His Majesty's Government are going to exploit this wonderful invention for the benefit of the Muslim world in riveting its already strong filial connections to its centre—Mecca. It is no idle dream to look forward to the day, which cannot be far off, when the call to prayers might be broadcast from the courtyard of the Kaaba to the eager ears of the whole Muslim world.

May Allah continue to guide the efforts and inspire the counsels of His Majesty in the creation of a united and strong Arabia.

Private Property in Islam and Christianity.

The Christian religion, as it is, has found no way of going through the pockets of the rich man. He has been left to spend his riches in accordance with his own sweet will. His wealth may go on multiplying till he can choke the throats of millions if it so please him. This is exactly what is happening in present-day industrial civilization. Death duties and surtaxes have been devised and applied to solve the problem. But even if they were efficacious, which they are not, one thing is certain; they are not the products of Christianity. They are rather the devices of tired brains; for already rich people are beginning to get round them by insuring themselves heavily.

How we are to remedy this egregious social sore of wealth accumulated in the hands of the few, which is at once a menace and a scandal, is the problem of the average man?

Christianity does not solve this problem. We are told by the Very Reverend the Dean of St. Paul's that "it is very fortunate that Christ left no definite rules, for they would

NOTES

have been a hindrance to the totally different conditions of industrial civilization" (*vide the Evening Standard* for April 16, 1930). Now it is exactly in these lines that a Muslim sees a great flaw in the teachings of Jesus Christ. For is it not a fact that the present-day trouble in industrial civilization is due to one fact—the continual silence of the Christian religion on matters which confront us in all the vital issues of our life? It is this deficiency in Christianity which Islam wants to make good. Would that our Christian friends would study Islam from this point of view.

The Dean realizes the importance of this problem when he says, "As most of us are Christians, we wish to know if the Gospels and the Church have anything to tell us about these conditions." He proceeds to give his views in the following words:

Jesus belonged to the hardy, independent, and well-educated peasantry of Northern Palestine. His outlook was curiously like that of the poet Wordsworth. Like Wordsworth, He loved mountains and children; like him, He lived very plainly but not ascetically; like him, He thought that "getting and spending, we lay waste our powers." He never calls the avaricious money-grubber a thief, but He does call him a fool. He found the rich unresponsive, with a few exceptions. Because their standard of values was radically wrong; but He reserved His indignation for hypocrisy, calculating worldliness, and hard-heartedness—faults which are not a monopoly of any one class.

In His public preaching He used telling, exaggerated epigrams, as all popular teachers have to do. For instance, He told us to turn the other cheek to the smiter; but when He was smitten Himself He did not do this, but replied with a dignified remonstrance. The words about the camel and the needle's eye are deliberately hyperbolic. When asked to adjudicate on a question of property He simply said that it was not His business, and added, "Take heed and beware of covetousness."

He certainly thought that a simple industrious life was the best; but there was nothing whatever of the revolutionary agitator in Him. He disliked all the unnecessary paraphernalia of life, because they distract our attention from the only things that really matter.

We may sum it up by saying that the Gospel is a revolutionary idealism which demonetises the world's currency, but which seeks only to change the heart, not external conditions. Conservatives dislike it because it is revolutionary, and revolutionaries because it is idealistic. Both sides in a class-war are equally un-Christian, because both have the same standard of values, the one which Christ condemned as "foolish." His thought moved on an altogether different plane from economic struggles.

What was and is the teaching of the Catholic Church about the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

rights of private property? The question was much discussed by theologians, and it turned on what was called the Law of Nature. This was a Stoical conception, and the Stoical jurists were not quite unanimous about it, some holding that Communism, and not private ownership, is in accordance with the Law of Nature.

The Catholic solution was, and still is, that though before the Fall there was no such thing as private property, and though there will be none in Heaven, there is a relative Law of Nature, adapted to the "fallen state" of humanity, and that this Law of Nature, which is valid for all men here and now, sanctions and prescribes private ownership.

Those who wish to live in a more heavenly manner must renounce the world and enter a monastery. So to this day a Catholic cannot be a Communist. The only dissentients from this solution were a few fanatical sectaries, of whom the Anabaptists are the best known. Their tenets are condemned in the Anglican Articles of Religion. "Christian men's goods are not common."

The Church recommended lavish charity, and condemned dishonest ways of making money; but its attitude towards ownership has been on the whole Conservative. The notion that all property belongs to "the State" has no support in Christian theory or practice, and is an impudent falsehood.

Even to a man of mean intelligence these words leave an impression of extreme meagreness and poverty of detail, which the Dean, as quoted above, admits. Have ever the problems of the world been solved by philosophical theorizing and sermons? It is the working out of details for the proper safeguarding of all the rights involved that can reveal to us the beauty of a system of life or religion. It is in this respect that Islam has triumphed over Christianity, which religion it came to complement.

What has Islam, on the other hand, done to control the immense wealth of the world and prevent it from getting concentrated in the hands of the select few? Unlike Christianity, it has laid down definite principles on which an elaborate edifice can be erected by the Muslims for the purpose of keeping human society well balanced. It has given, therefore, a clear conception of what should be considered as private property.

While Islam recognizes the existence of private property, it differs from other religions when it makes it incumbent upon the one who has earned greater rewards than others, through superior intellect or greater industry, to earmark a certain portion of his wealth for the benefit of those who could not

NOTES

so utilize their opportunities. The Qur-án says, " Give to your relations, the needy, the wayfarer, their rights " (xxx. 38). Again, " In the wealth of the rich, such as can express their wants and such as cannot (i.e. the animals) have a right." This right it recognized through the purely Islamic institution called Zakat, a tax of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on all money, precious metals and merchandise, of which a man has been in possession for one year or more. The proceeds of this tax are to be spent for the benefit of the poor. This institution goes a long way towards engendering sympathy in the breast of the rich man for the poor. The poor, on the other hand, begin to be aware of feelings of sympathy for their benefactors, and such a creation of healthy relations tends to a stable fabric of society. Besides, the law of primogeniture, the institution of usury which enables a man to get money without labour, monopoly and cornering (which is tantamount to exacting excessive profit), have been tabooed in Islam. Private property in Islamic countries is divided; each one member of the family thus gets a fair start in life. Christian countries, it is interesting to learn, are breaking the rigours of the law of primogeniture, thus coming nearer to the social ideals of Islam.

A New English Translation of the Qur-án

Size 9½ in. × 6½ in.; pp. cxix, 377, gilt-edged, cloth bound.

Price 12/6 net, postage 8d. extra.

By Al-Haj Hāfiz Ghulām Sarwar, M.A. (Punjab, 1894), B.A. (Cantab, 1897), Indian Gilchrist Scholar 1894-1897;

Imperial Institute Modern Languages Scholar

(Arabic) 1896-1900; Member of the Malayan

Civil Service 1898-1928; Mufti

of Penang; Civil District

Judge Singapore

1923-1928.

SPECIAL FEATURES

A comprehensive, critical review of the previous English Translations of the Qur-án; two essays on the life of Muhammad; complete summary of contents.

*Can be had from: The Author, 20, Malacca Street, Singapore, S.S.
The Manager, "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking.*

ISLAMIC REVIEW

WHAT IS ISLAM ?

[The following is a very brief account of Islam, and some of its teaching. For further details, please write to the IMAM of the Mosque, Woking.]

ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF PEACE.—The word Islam literally means: (1) Peace; (2) the way to achieve peace; (3) submission; as submission to another's will is the safest course to establish peace. The word in its religious sense signifies complete submission to the Will of God.

OBJECT OF THE RELIGION.—Islam provides its followers with the perfect code whereby they may work out what is noble and good in man, and thus maintain peace between man and man.

THE PROPHETS OF ISLAM.—Muhammad, popularly known as the Prophet of Islam, was, however, the last Prophet of the Faith. Muslims, i.e. the followers of Islam, accept all such of the world's prophets, including Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, as revealed the Will of God for the guidance of humanity.

THE QUR-ÁN.—The Gospel of the Muslim is the Qur-án. Muslims believe in the Divine origin of every other sacred book, but, inasmuch as all such previous revelations have become corrupted through human interpolation, the Qur-án, the last Book of God, came as a recapitulation of the former Gospels.

ARTICLES OF FAITH IN ISLAM.—These are seven in number: belief in (1) Allah; (2) angels; (3) books from God; (4) messengers from God; (5) the hereafter; (6) the measurement of good and evil; (7) resurrection after death.

The life after death, according to Islamic teaching, is not a new life, but only a continuance of this life, bringing its hidden realities into light. It is a life of unlimited progress; those who qualify themselves in this life for the progress will enter into Paradise, which is another name for the said progressive life after death, and those who get their faculties stunted by their misdeeds in this life will be the denizens of the hell—a life incapable of appreciating heavenly bliss, and of torment—in order to get themselves purged of all impurities and thus to become fit for the life in heaven. State after death is an image of the spiritual state in this life.

The sixth article of faith has been confused by some with what is popularly known as Fatalism. A Muslim neither believes in Fatalism nor Predestination; he believes in Premeasurement. Everything created by God is for good in the given use and under the given circumstances. Its abuse is evil and suffering.

PILLARS OF ISLAM.—These are five in number: (1) declaration of faith in the Oneness of God, and in the Divine Messengership of Muhammad; (2) prayer; (3) fasting; (4) almsgiving; (5) pilgrimage to the Holy Shrine of Mecca.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.—The Muslims worship one God—the Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of all the